STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- X

THOMAS JERMYN, on behalf of himself

and all others similarly situated, CIVIL ACTION NO. 08 CV 00214

Plaintiff, ECF ACTION

:

-againstBEST BUY STORES, L.P.'S

AMENDED ANSWER TO

BEST BUY STORES, L.P.,

PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT

Defendant.

----- X

BEST BUY STORES, L.P.'S AMENDED ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT

Now comes Defendant Best Buy Stores, L.P. ("Best Buy") to amended its Answer Plaintiff Thomas Jermyn's ("Plaintiff") Amended Complaint, dated March 26, 2008 ("Amended Complaint"). Best Buy specifically denies any allegations except as otherwise stated. Best Buy states and alleges as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

- 1. Best Buy admits that Plaintiff purports to bring this action as described in his Amended Complaint, but denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 1. Best Buy denies the substantive allegations contained in the Amended Complaint.
- 2. Best Buy admits that it offers a price match guarantee under certain circumstances. Best Buy denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 2. Best Buy affirmatively states that it has 935 stores operating in the United States under the Best Buy brand.
 - 3. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 3.

PARTIES

- 4. Best Buy admits that Plaintiff Thomas Jermyn purports to bring this action as described in paragraph 4. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 4, and therefore denies the same.
- 5. Best Buy denies that it is a Minnesota business entity and affirmatively states that it is a Limited Partnership formed under the laws of Virginia. Best Buy admits that its office and principal place of business is located at 7601 Penn Avenue South, Richfield, Minnesota. Best Buy denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 5. Best Buy affirmatively states that it has 935 stores operating in the United States under the Best Buy brand.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 6. Best Buy denies that it is a Minnesota corporation; rather, it is a Limited Partnership formed under the laws of Virginia. Best Buy denies the remaining allegations contained in paragraph 6 because Plaintiff cannot aggregate the claims of the putative class members to reach the \$75,000 amount in controversy required by 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
- 7. Best Buy denies that it is a Minnesota corporation; it is a Limited Partnership formed under the laws of Virginia. Best Buy admits that this Court has jurisdiction under the Class Action Fairness Act because Plaintiff has alleged that the amount in controversy exceeds \$5 million. Best Buy denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 7.
- 8. Best Buy admits that venue is appropriate in this District because Best Buy operates stores in this District.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND AND SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

9. Best Buy admits that one of multiple Best Buy stores located within City, State and County of New York is located at 60 West 23rd Street, New York, New York, 10010-5201.

Best Buy denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 9. Best Buy affirmatively states that it has 935 stores operating in the United States under the Best Buy brand.

- 10. Best Buy admits that a Best Buy receipt dated May 13, 2005, indicates Plaintiff purchased a Nikon D-70 camera from Best Buy for \$1,199.99.
- 11. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 11, and therefore denies the same.
- 12. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 12, and therefore denies the same.
- 13. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 13, and therefore denies the same.
- 14. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 14, and therefore denies the same.
- 15. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 15. A true and correct copy of the Best Buy Price Guarantee policy in existence in May 2005 is attached as Exhibit A.
- 16. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 16. A true and correct copy of the Best Buy Price Guarantee policy in existence in May 2005 is attached as Exhibit A.
- 17. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 17. A true and correct copy of the Best Buy Price Guarantee policy in existence in May 2005 is attached as Exhibit A.
 - 18. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 18.
- 19. Best Buy admits that on May 20, 2007, Plaintiff returned the Nikon camera to Best Buy. Best Buy denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 19.
- 20. Best Buy admits that, pursuant to its restocking fee policy, it charged Plaintiff a restocking fee of 15%, which totaled \$180.00, for returning the product because Plaintiff had

opened the box and the digital camera was not defective. Best Buy denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 20.

- 21. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 21, and therefore denies the same.
 - 22. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 22.
 - 23. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 23.
- 24. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 24 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation, and therefore, Best Buy denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).
- 25. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 25 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation and therefore, Best Buy denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).
- 26. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 26 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation and therefore, Best Buy denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).
- 27. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 27 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation and therefore, Best Buy

denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).

- 28. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 28 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation and therefore, Best Buy denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).
- 29. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 29 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation and therefore, Best Buy denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).
- 30. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 30 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation and therefore, Best Buy denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).
- 31. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 31 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation and therefore, Best Buy denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).

- 32. Best Buy states that the allegations contained in paragraph 32 are unattributable allegations from a website that lacks authentication and foundation and therefore, Best Buy denies the same. Best Buy further states that it is inappropriate for Plaintiff to "fill gaps in [his] factual allegations by reference to unnamed or anonymous sources in a newspaper article." *Walker v. S.W.I.F.T. SCRL*, 517 F. Supp. 2d 801, 806 (E.D. Va. 2007).
 - 33. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 33.
 - 34. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 34.
 - 35. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 35.
 - 36. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 36.
 - 37. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 37.
 - 38. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 38.
- 39. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge of Plaintiff's definitions of "goods," "commercial activities," and "interstate commerce" to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 39, and therefore denies the same.
 - 40. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 40.
 - 41. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 41.
- 42. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge of Plaintiff's definitions of the phrases "practices and advertisements" and "recurring in nature and directed at consumers" to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 42, and therefore denies the same.
 - 43. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 43.
- 44. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge of Plaintiff's definition of "ordinary consumers" to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 44, and therefore denies the same.
 - 45. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 45.

- 46. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 46.
- 47. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 47.
- 48. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 48.
- 49. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 49.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 50. Best Buy admits that Plaintiff purports to bring this action on behalf of a class pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b)(3), and denies all allegations in paragraph 50 inconsistent therewith. Best Buy denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 50.
- 51. Best Buy admits that Plaintiff purports to define the class as stated in paragraph 51.

NUMEROSITY

52. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 52.

COMMON QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT

- 53. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 53.
- 54. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 54.

TYPICALITY

55. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 55.

ADEQUACY OF REPRESENTATION

56. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 56.

PREDOMINANCE

57. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 57.

SUPERIORITY

58. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 58.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Common Law False Advertising)

- 59. Best Buy repeats, realleges, and incorporates, by this reference thereof, its responses to the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs as though set forth fully herein.
 - 60. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 60.
 - 61. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 61.
 - 62. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 62.
- 63. Best Buy lacks sufficient knowledge of Plaintiff's definitions of "goods," "services," "commercial activities," and "interstate commerce" to admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 63, and therefore denies the same.
 - 64. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 64.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Minn. Stat. § 325F.69 et. seq., Minnesota's Consumer Fraud Act)

- 65. Best Buy repeats, realleges, and incorporates, by this reference thereof, its responses to the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs as though set forth fully herein.
- 66. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 66. Best Buy further responds that Minn. Stat. § 325F.69 *et. seq.* speaks for itself.
- 67. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 67. Best Buy further responds that Minn. Stat. § 325F.69 *et. seq.* speaks for itself.
- 68. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 68. Best Buy further responds that Minn. Stat. § 325F.69 *et. seq.* speaks for itself.

- 69. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 69. Best Buy further responds that Minn. Stat. § 325F.69 *et. seq.* speaks for itself.
- 70. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 70. Best Buy further responds that Minn. Stat. § 325F.69 *et. seq.* speaks for itself.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of Minn. Stat. § 8.31 et. seq., Minnesota's Private Attorney General Statute)

[Third Cause of Action, paragraphs 71-76, removed from Amended Complaint per Court's April 4, 4008, Minute Entry.]

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of New York's General Business Law § 349 Deceptive Acts and Practices)

- 77. Best Buy repeats, realleges, and incorporates, by this reference thereof, its responses to the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs as though set forth fully herein.
- 78. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 78. Best Buy further responds that N.Y. Gen. Bus. L. § 349 *et. seq.* speaks for itself.
- 79. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 79. Best Buy further responds that N.Y. Gen. Bus. L. § 349 *et. seq.* speaks for itself.
- 80. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 80. Best Buy further responds that N.Y. Gen. Bus. L. § 349 *et. seq.* speaks for itself.

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Violation of New York's General Business Law § 350 Deceptive Acts and Practices)

- 81. Best Buy repeats, realleges, and incorporates, by this reference thereof, its responses to the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs as though set forth fully herein.
- 82. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 82. Best Buy further responds that N.Y. Gen. Bus. L. § 350 et. seq. speaks for itself.
- 83. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 83. Best Buy further responds that N.Y. Gen. Bus. L. 350 et. seq. speaks for itself.

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Unjust Enrichment)

- 84. Best Buy repeats, realleges, and incorporates, by this reference thereof, its responses to the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs as though set forth fully herein.
 - 85. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 85.
 - 86. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 86.
 - 87. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 87.
 - 88. Best Buy denies that it is obligated to make restitution as implied in paragraph 88.
 - 89. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 89.

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION

(Injunctive Relief)

- 90. Best Buy repeats, realleges, and incorporates, by this reference thereof, its responses to the allegations contained in all preceding paragraphs as though set forth fully herein.
 - Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 91. 91.

92. Best Buy denies the allegations in paragraph 92.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. Each of Plaintiff's Counts fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.
- 2. Plaintiff's claims are barred because an express contract controls.
- 3. Plaintiff lacks standing to bring the claims as alleged in the Amended Complaint.
- 4. Plaintiff is not entitled to any equitable relief because of Plaintiff's own unclean hands.
- 5. Plaintiff's recovery, if any, should be precluded or reduced to the extent that any such alleged damages (the existence and extent of which Best Buy expressly denies) could have been avoided had Plaintiff engaged in reasonable efforts to mitigate, minimize, or avoid the damages alleged.
- 6. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the equitable doctrines of laches, waiver, and estoppel.
- 7. Plaintiff's purported damages were caused in whole or in part by Plaintiff's own conduct, actions, omissions, delay, or failure to act.
 - 8. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the economic-loss doctrine.
 - 9. Best Buy has a defense of set-off with respect to Plaintiff.
- 10. Some members of Plaintiff's putative class claims are barred by applicable statutes of limitations.
- 11. Best Buy expressly and specifically reserves the right to amend this Answer to add, delete, or modify affirmative defenses based upon legal theories, facts, and circumstances which may or will be developed through discovery and/or further legal analysis of Plaintiff's claims and Best Buy's position in this litigation.

WHEREFORE, Best Buy respectfully requests that this Court:

- 1. enter judgment dismissing this action with prejudice;
- 2. award Best Buy its costs and disbursements; and
- 3. award Best Buy such other relief as the Court deems equitable, appropriate, and just under the circumstances.

DATED: June 4, 2008 ROBINS, KAPLAN, MILLER & CIRESI L.L.P.

By: s/ Jennifer G. Daugherty

Anne M. Lockner (admitted *pro hac vice*) Jennifer G. Daugherty (admitted *pro hac vice*)

2800 LaSalle Plaza 800 LaSalle Avenue Minneapolis, MN 55402-2015

(612) 349-8500 Tel: Fax: (612) 339-4181

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT BEST BUY STORES, L.P.

80105400.1

EXHIBIT A

Best Buy return & exchange policies

30 day ratum parad hama a mana ahan a mana ahang day ram ha an a

14 day return period ingene of we occert elum: o exchanges 4 days from the organal curchase on computer, nominals, printers, retected computers, comcorders, digital comeras and rada detector.

restocking fee trains determs a redocking fee of up to 15% asy to mage or organed notebook compares control detailed lighter control and additional defeatives a redocking fee training. 25% may be charged on Special Order Products, industing appliances.

missing item or damaged product fee
A make the ordering color of any actual to any
added missing the organistics, partiagning material contents,
accesses and orminate any ordering material contents.

return and exchange requirements
(x) organizations requirements
(x) organizations required to all return exchanges pro-

41 etums, exchanges and once adjustments, must se mode in the country of original purchase

To cach purchase one \$250 and thed succipates one \$100 your about all its same by cheek formor coporate office within \$12 burners days of the equi-

price guarantea will say that lovestore if within 30 days 14 days to compute montror rotered computer, printer consorders Agric common and add conserved of you process from Destroy, you find a social computer (Code) there a distributed by the process or conserved to the conserved or destroy of the difference. Bing ut selfication of the lower price, plus your original Beat Buy recept to claim your referral Does not apply to specials bonus or free offers and in California, cellular obtaines and pagein

note regarding personal data on returned or exchanged products Peas more at geann data (s.) consults on electrical data

rideotypes from any sea ned a carifornged product. Best by a not expensible for any second docated may be made a colonigad

non-returnable Irems include; the and a malatina are cosmable lens with as hone and all and load and all inc. a lens that are danaged a stated. The following lens. If expend a detail or any available to an even a charge on the identical advit compute official DVD in VMS ridge. Also games and masse, with the changle missting the original times at Product Code. (UPC) are only available for an even exchange on the identical product

Any product that is that need without a promotional itemity included with the original transaction (e.g. say PV get the DVD staye. Buy PV get for gift and company TV get DVD playe. Including the first only and company of the company of the definition of the definition of the production of the definition of the company o

Any product that was concluded when a matern ebote was available on the purchase is subject to travery the amount of the existe deducted from the estimal amount

Warranty information

End Uter Collivare License Agreements may be available for review on request ene user litense agreement

limited quantities Verse the obtaining confine

rebate policy
Unless noted otherwise all statutes are limited to one
per product per household or address. Best Bay mail in
relates typically come in two forms! Checks, and issuate CitiConds, separe Citi-Conds are redeemable for merchandlas
or cash mation, all other Citi-Conds on incleamable to

privacy policy

(va. s.e. meserd for earning more about 50 millions)

(million about 50 million for the about 50 million of million for the second 50 million of million for the second 50 million for t WHY SESSION COT

Best Buy reserves the right to deny any

Policies of BestBuy, commoy vary from our in-store policies: Please see BestBuy, com for details.

Sec o Customer Service Representative for detail

Debit Cards Accepted Here

WSK

論

187 Carried A 1 DK VE STAN 8 Control of the Contro 2000年 į 1 I Ö

BBJM 000001 Confidential

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name: **THOMAS JERMYN**, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated v.

BEST BUY STORES, L.P.

Court File No: **08-00214**

I hereby certify that on June 4, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing documents: DEFENDANT BEST BUY STORES, L.P.'S AMENDED ANSWER TO PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED COMPLAINT, with EXHIBIT A, and this Certificate of Service with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF System, which shall send notification of such filing to the following:

Gary S. Graifman	ggraifman@kgglaw.com
Todd C. Norbitz	tnorbitz@foley.com
Anne M. Lockner	amlockner@rkmc.com
Jennifer G. Daugherty	jgdaugherty@rkmc.com

In addition, all of the preceding documents were served via email and first-class mail this 4th day of June upon the following:

> Michael L. Braunstein, Esq. KANTROWITZ, GOLDHAMER & GRAIFMAN, P.C. 747 Chestnut Ridge Road, Suite 200 Chestnut Ridge, NY 10977-6216

Yonaton Aronoff, Esq. FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 90 Park Avenue New York, NY 10016

> s/ Jennifer G. Daugherty Jennifer G. Daugherty